

## City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

**Board or Committee:** Design Review Board, Regular Meeting  
**Date and Time:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 at 6:00 pm  
**Meeting Location:** 120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room  
**DRB Members Present:** Chair Paul Durand, Ernest DeMaio, David Jaquith, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan  
**DRB Members Absent:** Chris Dynia, Glenn Kennedy  
**Others Present:** Tom Devine, Senior Planner  
**Recorder:** Colleen Brewster

Chair Paul Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:10PM. Roll call was taken.

### **Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review**

1. **120 Washington Street (Peabody Block LLC c/o RCG LLC):** Discussion and vote on proposed deck and entryway area.

Andrew Zimmerman of RCG, LLC, Jim Gagnon, and Pete Pitman (Project Architect) were present to discuss the project.

Zimmerman stated that they received approval from the DRB in June, and from the SRA in July, but the decisions required coming back for review of the entry and deck. The retail will remain on the first floor. The project consists of 14 new residential units on the upper floors and a new roof deck at the upper interior corner at the three commercial roof top areas. The SRA feedback was to provide; 1) additional detail on roof deck, 2) a dark stain on deck, and 3) a front deck paving treatment at the ramp up and into the building.

Pitman stated that the roof deck will not extend all the way across the roof due to an area with existing rooftop equipment. It will be a common area used by all tenants, will be made accessible, and be accessed with French doors. The existing façade pilaster and paneling details at grade are replicated to continue the façade pattern above. The newel posts will be robust and aligned with the pilasters below. The handrail will be a pre-engineered system painted white. The decking will also be a composite for easy maintenance with a dark stain, and a consistent edge line will be created at the roof even in areas where there is no deck. The deck was not pulled further away from the roof edge as to not complicate the structural design within existing tenant spaces and because it would be seen no matter where it is located on the roof. Sconces will be added around the deck perimeter to provide light instead of the previously proposed wall packs.

Pitman stated that the goal at the main entry was to deinstitutionalize the entrance and make it more intimate and inviting. Much of the hard surfaces will be removed, but a central accessible route entry will remain. English-Ivy planting beds with corten steel surrounds will be added on either side of the entry. New galvanized steel railings with pickets to be painted matte black will be added. The wainscoting paneling will be

removed, new recessed lighting added in the soffit, and a new storefront entry consisting of frameless vision glass, sidelites, and transom and a magnetized frameless door with stainless steel ladder pulls will be installed. There will be new branding, and exterior painted tenant list, and an interior facelift in the lobby. The exposed brick façade will be painted white and will continue to the outside entry wall.

Jaquith stated that the pilasters on Drawing A-5 look too large and Sides agrees. Jaquith stated that the lighting at deck perimeter looks out of place and could be swapped for downlights. Sides and Durand agree that downlights will illuminate and not project light. Jaquith stated that the front entry handrail should wrap around towards the back-side railings or could continue to the side walls. Sullivan suggested that the green space on the left go up to the storefront as well as the railing. Pitman replied that the entry door will swing to the left and a tenant call box will be wall mounted on the right. Jaquith stated that the directory should be mounted on something and not painted on the wall so tenant names can be easily changed. Jaquith added that the green spaces may not last with the lack of sun on that side of Washington Street.

Jaquith noted that the pendant style “120” building address needs to be mounted level as the single rods may not last. Durand added that the rods could be bent easily if they were to be hit and suggested that the numbers be applied to the glass. Zimmerman suggested decals that the light can still illuminate.

Sides voiced concern with the proposed painted trim wall being the only thing that separates it from the brick. Pitman replied that what’s behind the wall could be problematic as it is possible that the wainscoting may be there to hide the condition underneath. Sides suggested a simplified panel to match the new simplified look and a washed brick instead of a full coat of paint. Zimmerman replied that the wall reveal will also be at the interior but separated by vision glass. Pitman replied that they can carry the wash all the way through into the Lobby to show the beauty of the old brick, and during demolition, if more than a wash is required, they will return to the DRB. They can also resubmit for the deck light fixture. Jaquith suggested a wall mounted rectangular can light at the deck to wash the wall with light. Pitman proposed that to get light towards the center of the deck, recessed lights be added to the interior face of the newel posts. No board members opposed this suggestion. DeMaio noted that exterior lights could affect the residential units across the street. Pitman replied that he can submit a lighting package for review. Jaquith suggested including several waterproof outlets at the deck.

Sullivan asked how the railings engage the existing second floor walls. Pitman replied that it is with a rosette. DeMaio asked where the membrane terminates. Pitman replied that the membrane will not be visible from the street, but be concealed with copper flashing, and the roof below the new deck will slope towards internal drains.

Durand asked about proposed furnishings and noted that the fenced edge will help conceal the furnishings and provide a private space. Despite furniture not being shown on the plan, he wouldn’t want to see any umbrellas or tall items, only low table heights and chairs. Pitman agreed from a liability standpoint and stated that only standard table heights would be used.

*Chair Durand opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Durand closes public comment.*

Sides: Motion to approve deck and entryway with the following conditions:

1. Deck newel posts shall be narrowed.
2. Deck furniture are restricted to standard table height or lower.
3. Replace proposed deck scone lights with white can downlight scone, which may be located on deck side of newel posts as long as they face downward toward deck surface.
4. Replace hanging metal address numbers at building entrance with decal on transom window.
5. Whitewash brick on northern entry wall instead of painting white. Return to DRB and SRA with alternate treatment if conditions do not allow this.
6. Replace stenciled directory at entrance with attached lettering that can be swapped out with changing tenants.

Seconded by: DeMaio. Passes 5-0.

**2. 30 Church Street (East Regiment Beer Company):** Discussion and vote on proposed signage (sign permit) and outdoor seating area (café permit) scheme.

Scott Perry, part owner of East Regiment Beer Company, was present to discuss the project.

Devine stated that the City has reviewed the sign permit applicant and confirmed that it complies with all dimensional standards.

Perry presented color samples for the awning in a "Forest Green" and the fencing to separate the tap room from the public will be a mild steel railing. The signage arm will be wrought iron provided by Peabody Sign Co. Details on the anchors secured to the brick have been submitted. The lighting will not be mounted to the corner of the tower as to not bother the residential neighbors, but will be over the tap room area. Lighting within the tent will be string Edison bulbs over the seating area and pendant lights over the bar.

Sides asked for clarification on the items proposed. Perry replied that the awning panels will cover the entire tap room during the winter. Sides had no issue with the lighting and furniture. Perry noted that the furniture will be either collapsible or stackable and the tables can be pulled apart since there is limited floor space. Perry said the sides of the enclosure will be closed during the winter and roll up and stay out of sight the other three seasons. The roof will stay on all year round. Low intensity natural gas heaters will have sufficient clearance below the underside of the awning to operate. The railing can be welded metal or wood with wood beams and paneling at the wall, as the corrugated metal was not well received. A wooden shelf will be on top, and he will build the pieces himself. Sides replied that the wood fencing could be too rustic and prefers an option with more transparency. She noted that she has no issue with the shelf and bar stop.

Sides asked how the different elements attach to one another. Perry replied that a shop drawing was provided.

Jaquith stated that the awning support is low at 7 feet above the deck is low and suggested a 7'-6" minimum. The existing path has forced the tap room area to not be a perfect rectangle, which would require a change in the pitch at each awning support member, but the shop drawing provided shows the awning as perfectly square. The top of the awning must remain parallel to the brick and that detail must be worked out. Perry replied that they have 4 feet of additional height above the top of the proposed awning to raise it up. DeMaio asked how the awning will terminate at the face of the building. Perry replied that it is with a metal clip secured to the face of the wall and sealed behind the clip to ensure that it's weatherproof. Sullivan asked if there will be any additional drawings. Perry replied that they are overbudget on planning and hope to put additional money towards the construction and the document provided is their only shop drawing. Jaquith stated that he would want to see awning shop drawings. DeMaio stated that the proposed design has a suburban strip mall feel and the fabric structures should be more elegantly put together. Durand suggested a color change from Forest Green to a subtler Pebble Tweed.

Sides suggests a mock-up of how it would be constructed and to see the fittings, edge condition, and overhangs, to ensure the end result isn't primitive. Durand stated that quality control is a concern since this is a permanent structure made with temporary materials near the heart of downtown Salem. The Board is used to seeing more details and realistic renderings. Perry compared his proposed structure to the Lobster Shanty and noted that the proposed design seems very temporary because they intend to put the bulk of their money into their product. Sullivan suggested Perry review what the Lobster Shanty provided to know what the DRB is used to receiving and noted that this location deserves a well-thought-out design, flooring materials, access transition from sidewalk to the ramp, and visuals of the complete design. Perry stated that the awning company is aware of the existing conditions and they can provide better renderings. Sullivan stated that the numerous options are appreciated; however, they would appreciate a more definitive design rather than expecting them to select things for the applicant. Sides stated that there needs to be a unified vision of what it will actually look like, though the direction seems acceptable. Sides suggested that Perry build a 4-foot section and provide photos and examples of similar ones on Newbury Street. Any signage integrated into the structure should also be provided. Perry stated that he will return with better shop drawings showing the irregular supports and how they will be laid out and supported, as well as the drink shelf and how it meets the supports. Sullivan suggested that a cross-section be provide that also shows the transitions to the sidewalk.

*Chair Durand opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Durand closes public comment.*

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the January 24, 2018 meeting.  
Seconded by: Durand. Sullivan 5-0.

**3. 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 Washington Street, and 231-251 Washington Street (Hampton Inn, Mixed-Use Development Project):** Discussion and vote on proposed revisions to final design

Attorney Thomas Alexander of Alexander & Femino, Drew Queen, Project Architect, and Ken McClure were present to discuss the project.

Tom Devine read a December 19, 2017 email from Historic Salem, Inc. written by Emily Udy and Jennifer Firth.

Atty. Alexander stated that changes have been made to the plan based on the previous DRB recommendations. While they respectfully understand that Historic Salem may have their opinions on this project they have not had the benefit of their input on this project up to this point. McClure stated that all of the materials on this project are premium grade and they have used the DRB's previous comments to move the project forward.

Queen stated that at the corner of Washington and Dodge Streets they've revised signage band so it is no longer a smooth surface, but now has masonry with some delineation where the signage band would occur. There is a simple horizontal cornice band that sticks out about 18" and reconciles the various depth changes of the panels in the upper floors of the façade. Awnings were added to the images to create a more pedestrian friendly atmosphere as well as outdoor seating and umbrellas.

Queen stated that for the transition area of the façade, between the corner element and the brick residential façade of Washington Street, the third of three options was selected with a metal shingle, which is the same material used around the corner on Dodge Street.

Queen noted that the floor plans are preliminary construction documents. Level one is the hotel with stepped commercial units. Parking level 2 will be valet only. Parking level 2 and building level 2 will be parking, hotel rooms, and residential units. Parking level 3 will be accessed off of the upper portion of Washington Street.

Durand stated that the board gave them direct items to address after last meeting and the proposed materials are high quality and will look better than the letter from Historic Salem predicts. The bulk of the items were approved. The elevation images have come a long way from their flat façade concerns. He is not sold on awnings, which look too simple. Sides asked what the corner material would be. Queen replied a polished masonry. DeMaio asked about the setback distance of the thin cornice line to the face of the darker façade above. Queen replied that it is 4" with an overall depth of 12", with the corner being at a zero plane. The 4" ledge will be a sloped metal roof material with a hemmed edge out ACM, an alum composite material with tight joints. The cornice projection at that corner will be 18" at the underside and above above the awnings. The light thin band is the aluminum composite and the dark gray above it the cembrit panel. DeMaio asked why there are spandrel panels between the windows of the deep recesses at the upper façade of Dodge Street but not along Washington Street. Queen replied that the previously approved window arrangement was duplicated.

Sides stated that she liked a different style of window being used at the transition wall. DeMaio agrees, but noted that he doesn't like the panel color at that section and would prefer the shingle color on the other side. Sides added that option A too complicated to make the clear break and option C is too similar. Queen replied that option B is a window wall system with glass down to floor and a metal piece covering the 8" thick, and two grilles for the HVAC unit at either side of the edge in a charcoal color. All Board members prefer option B.

Sides stated that the red awning at the restaurant is distracting and grey or maroon would blend better with the building. Durand suggested using only umbrellas at the tables. Sullivan noted that awnings are a conventional treatment at each window bay and whatever treatment is used should either be continuous and wrap around the building or not be used at all. The Board members agreed.

Sullivan asked that the landscaping in front be addressed. Queen replied that the paving was a previously approved in two different colors of grey, there are steps and the number of risers vary based on the slope of the grade, and there are L-shaped groupings of granite blocks that are the retaining walls. The patterns and landscaping of the previous version would remain.

Queen presented a sample of the corner masonry material that will be full bed depth, 4"D x 24"L x 8"H. Durand suggested a dark grey/charcoal or black awning to pick up some of the tones in the corner material. DeMaio stated that he still has concerns with the double window on Washington Street with the spandrel, and would prefer that it be recessed to match the others. The single set of windows could also be setback.

DeMaio stated that the thin cornice is a material that comes from nowhere and requires more detail. It projects 18", angles 45 degrees, and has a roof. Jaquith added that the top will have a slope that is visible in addition to the 4" extension beyond the panel above it. Queen replied that it could be on the same plane. DeMaio added that this feels like a contemporary box sitting on a classical base and the corner feels different. The color, material, and depth changes are a concern which he believes is what was being addressed in the letter submitted from Historic Salem. Sides believes the cornice wants to match the color at the restaurant below and to be a part of ground floor. DeMaio asked if the masonry corner material can be made into a coping. Durand stated that the color could be charcoal like the awnings. Sides stated that this prominent corner and the weight of the upper portion on top of that corner is important. DeMaio noted that it's a fourth material being added. It's the thinnest, has the most changes in plane, is a roof, is made of metal that won't be as uniform and reliable of a surface because, and it will have seams so it won't look like it does in the rendering. Sides asked Queen for alternate material for the cornice. Queen suggested a glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRP) with no joints that can be molded into different shapes. Sides suggested that the color match the dark color of the stonework and be a solid material, but they'd need a sample and more information. DeMaio stated that its execution is important.

Sullivan added that there are structural elements that don't associate with what's above and the columns are disjointed in many different cases which make it difficult to understand. At the pedestrian level it is good to embrace the street and he is in favor of the undulation of the façade, but there needs to be some unification, consistency, and a pattern.

Durand stated that the restaurant entry at the corner is not prominent and a recessed entry or separate awning could make it stand out since it looks like all the other window openings. Sullivan noted that the Army Barracks door is setback from the corner. Sides noted that the awning could have the name of the restaurant to indicate the entrance. Durand suggested a wrap corner that is treated differently. Sullivan asked if the corner is rectangular structurally. Queen replied yes. Sides stated that the cornice is more of a concern than the transparent ground level.

*Chair Durand opens public comment.*

Josh Turiel, Ward 5 City Councilor. He was in favor of the initial design with two separate buildings to reduce its mass and make it more of a natural fit to the neighborhood. The Washington & Dodge Street corner has been a concern he became comfortable with, but the newly proposed corner resembles more Manhattan than Salem. Something should be done to give it a more small city character, possibly changing some elements of the cube, more ornamental pieces, or color changes. This corner doesn't fit and the Board did a good job pointing out those inconsistencies.

Tim Jenkins 18 Broad Street. He agrees the previous comments that the Washington & Dodge Street corner seems bland, the awnings and their color don't work, and there is a lack of detail. Atty. Alexander replied that the previous design couldn't be built economically and they are concerned with timing because they would like to break ground in the spring. He suggested a conditional approval with the cornice subject to further review and approval, and acknowledged that the design won't be perfect for everyone, with some board members wanting it more contemporary and others less contemporary.

Jaquith asked if there would be a review of the working drawings. Durand replied that the design is close although the renderings don't match the look of the materials. The concern is the material and color at the cornice, but the materials are high quality. Sides stated the project could move forward; however, the cornice should be a solid material like the GFRC with some weight to it, because DeMaio's concerns are accurate. DeMaio noted that with a contemporary design the cornice needs a clean execution and the pieces simplified, but the material, color, and execution are the most important at the cornice. Durand suggested a conditional approval.

Durand questioned where the public parking would be located. McClure replied that they did a number of studies and their goal is to maintain the residential on the top floor, hotel on the second, and public on the first and to keep them separate for security. They can continue to study it moving forward if necessary.

Sides: Motion to approve with the following conditions:

- The DRB approves option B for the transitional building segment between the hotel and mixed residential/commercial portions of the building.
- The top two floors of third column of windows on the Washington St. elevation shall be recessed in the same manner as the top two floors of the rightmost column of windows on the Dodge St. elevation.
- Applicant shall return to the DRB and SRA for review of revised plans for the restaurant corner awning and cornice.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 5-0.

### **Old/New Business**

### **Minutes**

There are no minutes to review.

### **Meeting Schedule**

Jaquith: Motion to approve the meeting schedule for 2018.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 5-0.

### **Adjournment**

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:00PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City  
Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.